Among all means of liberation, devotion, verily, is the most potent.
—*The Crest Jewel of Wisdom*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 55 JUNE, 1967 NUMBER 8

THE ONE FOUNDATION TRUTH

THE mind of an epoch or age has been characterized in Theosophical writings as a great cloud which hangs over mankind, in which, from time to time, rifts may be made to appear. Ideally, one may think, the dissipation of that cloud is accomplished by the fires of human aspiration, which have the power, so to speak, to "burn" it away, permitting the sunlight to reach the earth.

But the arousal of the higher longings of human beings is enwrapped in a twofold mystery—that of the unknown laws and possibilities of karmic cycles, something of which, in time, may be learned; and that of the unpredictable currents of individual resolve. There is also a third factor—the work of the wise in collaboration with cyclic law—and of this men in the world know little beyond the veiled instruction of legend and myth, which is to say, they know no more than they have been told. In time, even this knowledge is clouded or worn away.

What does a Teacher do? By the power of his own being, he makes a break in the cloud by entering the world and taking, or seeming to take, a part in the affairs of men. This is an act in some way involving the psycho-dynamics of spiritual development, and it must be guided, in the case of the wise, by foreknowledge of the potentialities of the cycle and by awareness of the dangers which may result from a display of capacities precocious to human understanding at that time. There are also the explanations appropriate to the cyclic interval in which the help is offered. In the words of

the true teacher, therefore, it is possible to discern two ever-present qualities or themes: the teaching always speaks to the condition of man in that epoch, showing both precise and friendly understanding, and this knowledge moves in a strong flow toward higher levels of awareness; the other theme, which can hardly be separated from the first, has the timeless content of self-knowledge, which is the indispensable key to all human growth. Self-knowledge is also the source of whatever strength may be gained by human beings to penetrate and raise the cloud.

Essentially, therefore, the processes of cyclic change in human attitudes impose upon those in whom they take place the necessity of learning to speak in two languages. There is first the language of the *status quo*—it might be called the language of the "cloud"—the common and acceptable speech, with all its limited ideas of "reality" and consequent theories of human good through "adjustment" to what are held to be the necessities of existence. This is the language we learn simply by being born into the world and entering into the various relationships which have, for the mind engaged with "facts," an apparent fixity and finality. The other language is one which whispers ideas of higher and further possibilities. It is the language of a new birth for human beings. Simply because it is new, and because nothing new is learned without connection with the old, this new language uses words which are familiar, while giving them a transformed meaning. The vocabulary is often the same as in the old language, yet the grammar is different—that is, it leads, if studied carefully, to a new range of meanings and points to a higher horizon than that previously admitted or known.

This transition from an old language to a new—really a change from one scheme of felt reality to another—has one great and unavoidable effect. It fills men with a vast uncertainty. To everyone who attempts the change, there come feelings of loss of the securities he once enjoyed, and at the same time doubts about the stability of the new toward which he is reaching. It is as though everything a man takes hold of becomes slippery, and while he may tell himself that the confidence he once felt in firm and well-defined realities was itself an illusion, providing seeming strength only from its acceptance by the great majority of men, this abstract comfort, being only an intellectual deduction, is a pale and bloodless reference for the hungry heart. There is now but one salvation, one clue, one path, to the solid ground that has been lost, and it lies, for this inter-

mediate condition, in the feeling of universal brotherhood. Sometimes the feeling of brotherhood bursts in upon us with a shock of recognition—that the need of others is not different from the need we feel ourselves, that only the stuff of compassion gives an unshakeable foundation on which to stand.

And so it is, and has always been, that the true teacher builds his work on this deep verity, without which there can be nothing but illusion, disappointment, fright at loss of place, and failure. Even as doctrine we can understand this truth, and while the repetition of doctrine is not the same as living practice, the doctrine stands like a sentry in the night. When at last the day dawns for taking new steps and making new beginnings, it is there as an old friend, and we welcome it into our being. A sentiment, an ethical precept no longer, it now grows into spontaneous expression, and the laws of being and becoming unite into a single truth.

The Expanding Mind

Our culture has truckled to the times—to the senses. It is not manworthy. If the vast and the spiritual are omitted, so are the practical and the moral. It does not make us brave or free. We teach boys to be such men as we are. We do not teach them to aspire to be all they can. We do not give them a training as if we believed in their noble nature. . . . The object of Education should be commensurate with the object of life. It should be a moral one: to teach self-trust; to inspire the youthful man with an interest in himself; with a curiosity touching his own nature; to acquaint him with the resources of his mind, and to teach him that there is all his strength, and to inflame him with a piety towards the Grand Mind in which he lives. Thus would education conspire with the Divine Providence. A man is a little thing whilst he works by and for himself, but, when he gives voice to the rules of love and justice, is godlike, his word is current in all countries; and all men, though his enemies, are made his friends and obey it as their own.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson

THE BIRTH OF SPACE

Know, the stars yonder, the stars everlasting,
Are fugitive also. . . .
—RALPH WALDO EMERSON

WAVES of credulity and of mental analysis alternately sweep across the face of the world. To the period of blind belief, which made possible the prospect of mediæval Christendom, enveloped by a black cloud of false science and theological dogma, has succeeded an epoch of expansion of the mind's forces, a wave of all-dissolving analysis, prompting us to lift the veil of seeming from the face of Truth, to pierce through the shell of appearances to the central reality.

The physical scientists long led the van of the new era. Theirs were the triumphs over the dark places of nature and the falsehoods of tradition. But they have failed to gauge the force of the wave that carried them forward, and unless their whole front is changed, they will become in their turn the credulous; the reactionists against a new party of advance. Their error is that they believe too much —that their enquiring analysis does not go deep enough. For the wave of thought which is permeating us, will finally obliterate and render unrecognisable many of our present idols and unquestioned verities—ideas now undoubted even by doubting science.

The last of the old-world ideas to perish—and that after the lapse of ages, perhaps—will be the most familiar and commonplace.

Perhaps last of all will fade our present conceptions of what Carlyle calls the deepest of all illusory appearances—Space and Time.

But as the sunrise first gilds the mountain-tops, and then floods the plain with light, so the approaching inspiration of knowledge appears first in a few of the best minds, and then spreads to the multitude. Thus we find already Descartes doubting the reality of the external world; and Wordsworth, striking the walls of his room

---

NOTE.—This article was printed in *Lucifer* for March, 1888, and appears in THEOSOPHY for the first time.

to assure himself that they were objective, and not mere phantoms projected into the void of nothingness by the mind's formative power; for this idea, he thought, must be shunned as maddening; forgetting that two senses may concur to deceive.

Space, whether treated by the physicist or the psychologist of the modern world, remains an unquestioned reality, whether objectively in nature or subjectively in the mind.

All the conceptions of science are three-dimensional, endowed with length, breadth, and height, whether we take the starry depths as pictured by the author of *First Principles;* or the human brain, in the conception of the last would-be scientific school.

But are not the properties of Space indeed mere appearances, and is not Wordsworth's fear a shadowy premonition of the truth, that Space is but a creature of the mind—an unreality?

This suspicion of the illusiveness of Space is one of the nascent perceptions of that most new and yet most ancient school of thought, whose wide generalisation will soon render obsolete and insignificant the daring doubts of sceptical science. In dealing with space and its dimensions, it is incumbent on us to show how our present conceptions of these could have been generated, on a purely idealistic hypothesis. If unreal, can we trace the growth of our notions of space and its dimensions? A theory readily presents itself; but to approach its consideration we must waive that larger question of the apparent separation of the One into innumerable units of consciousness, and, beginning by considering the condition of one such unit, trace the growth of the conceptions of space, as related to that unit.

Let us first picture such an individualised unit of consciousness—to use, perhaps, the best available phrase—at the very beginning of its evolutionary course, in quiescence, absolutely sensationless; let us endow it with the power of sensation, though in a latent form. To understand this, we must use a simple simile. Suppose yourself alone in a dark room in silence; suppose the temperature and your position to be such that you have become oblivious to your body; none of the senses are exercised; the pictorial power of the imagination is also at rest; while the mind's attitude is one of expectation directed towards the sense of hearing. This is the best available illustration of the condition of a unit of consciousness with the latent power of sensation, before sensation has set in. Suppose a musical note to sound close to the ear, and gradually die away; let the sound

be again gradually excited, and again die away. The ear—the seat of sensation—is for our purposes practically a point. The sense of hearing experiences a sensation, at first vivid, then gradually ceasing; then again increasing to vivid activity, and again sinking to rest. As far as physical knowledge shows, this changing sensation is represented by greater or less intensity of vibration of the tympanum.

Now instead of a note dying away naturally, suppose some sustained note sounded near the ear, then withdrawn in a straight line until out of hearing; then again brought near the ear, and again withdrawn. If the experiment be properly carried out, the experience of the sense of hearing will be exactly the same as before; their physical counterpart again being a greater or less intensity of tympanal vibration. The ear is absolutely powerless to distinguish between the two sets of sensations; and the only conception of nearness and distance that can be formed, having regard to the sense of hearing alone, is a greater or less intensity of sensation.

This is equally true of other senses taken separately; the sense of light, for example, or the sense of heat. Hence, as far as the sense of sight is concerned, the nearest stars are distinguished from the more remote chiefly by the greater intensity of their light, and, therefore, of the vibrations they excite on the retina. In fact, to speak physically, all our perceptions of varying sensation actually have their origin in a more or less intense vibration of the sensory surfaces, and their sources are subsequently projected into space by the imagination. To express the same thing from the idealist standpoint; all we experience is more or less intense sensation; our further conceptions are due to the separation and arrangement of these, by the imagination.

Taste is an example of a sense not yet translated into terms of nearness and distance, and it is worth mention that this is supposed by some Theosophists to be the sense at present undergoing development, and consequently incomplete.

But to return to our unit of consciousness: let us suppose a sensory point to be formed in it; let a simple sensation excite this sensory centre, with increasing and diminishing intensity. The effect will be exactly the same as if the exciting source were to approach and recede from the sensory point. From this experience, the conception of nearness and distance would arise; in other words, the conception of space of one dimension.

The conception of the point is derived from a sustained sensation; that of the line, from a sensation of decreasing and increasing intensity. So long as the consciousness remained absorbed in sensation no advance would be made on this conception of space of one dimension; but since all degrees of intensity from the very highest to complete absence of sensation may be experienced, this line, this space of one dimension, will be conceived as of infinite extension.

Let the consciousness of the unit now be supposed to reflect on this simple sensation, to stand aside from the point of sensation, and to regard objectively both that point and the varying intensity of the sensation; in other words, the sensory point, and the line of sensation, along which the exciting cause is conceived as advancing and receding. Suppose the sensation to diminish in intensity; that is to say, let the exciting source recede to a point some distance along the imaginary line. The new point of consciousness arrived at by the act of reflexion, or contemplative standing aside, is outside the line from the sensory point to the exciting source. It is clear that these three points not in the same straight line imply a plane triangle —which may be formed by joining them—hence the present attitude of the unit of consciousness implies space of two dimensions. But since the base of the highest intensity to absolute cessation—and since the point assumed by the consciousness through the act of reflexion can have no definite position, the present attitude of the unit implies two-dimensional space of infinite extension.

If the unit be conceived as having germs of two senses instead of one the results are identical, since in the first phase of consciousness, though we have two independent straight lines radiating from the unit of consciousness, instead of one plane triangle we should have two, both in the same plane. This holds good for any number of senses. The triangle formed with the line of sensation as base, and the point of reflexion assumed by the consciousness, as apex, is a sensory area every point of which is an objective source of perception to the unit of consciousness.

The perception of the unit of consciousness is now of two kinds; the first, exercised at the sensory centre, is one of varying intensity merely, corresponding in space to the line. That at the point of reflexion, the apex of the triangle of perception is one of observation, corresponding to surface extension.

Let the consciousness of the unit now be supposed to stand back

from the point of reflexion, and to contemplate objectively the area of perception. Standing apart from the area of perception, it now corresponds to a point outside the plane of a surface, and this implies space of three dimensions. Since the position of the new point of consciousness, the point of contemplation, let us term it, is not rigidly determined, and since the surface of perception is unlimited, this third attitude of the unit of consciousness implies three-dimensional space of unlimited extension.

As the last phase of perception was represented by a triangle, so this third phase may be represented by a triangular pyramid, or tetrahedron—every point in which is an object of perception; the whole forming a sensory solid—and having four corners; the top being now the seat of consciousness; one of the base corners, the point of reflexion, or perception of the sensory area—the base; another base corner being the point of sensation of variations in intensity; and the third base corner being the position to which the imagination projects the source of sensation.

Let us now translate these successive experiences into terms of Consciousness.

The first attitude of the unit of consciousness may be expressed by the unreflecting, and, so to speak, unconscious perception—in the sense of being without self-consciousness—"sensation is, or sensation is not."

When the stage of reflexion is reached, the consciousness may be thus expressed: "I experience sensation."

The third, the contemplative phase, is, "It is I who experience sensation"; or, "I am conscious that I experience sensation"; the second "I" here being personality, lower self, or false ego—an object consciousness to the first "I," the true ego, the unknowable Knower.

We are debarred from discussing fully the ethical aspects of these phases of consciousness by the nature of the subject; for—while we were compelled to begin by considering the condition of an individualised unit of consciousness, waiving the consideration of the apparent separation of the One into innumerable units—the subject of ethics deals almost entirely with the relation of the unit to the One, for "separation of the divine-human spirit into the multitudes of men on the earth" is only an illusion, and is in reality non-existent.

Let us now consider a few resultant truths.

The consciousness, whether in its first phase of absorbing sensation, or in its later phases of reflexion and contemplation, is itself subject to no dimensions of space; it stands detached from space, whether of one, two, or three dimensions. Hence the self is neither finite, in the sense of being small, nor infinite, in the sense of being great, it is superior to space, as to time, or, in the language of the *Upanishads,* "the self is smaller than small, and greater than great." The self, the knower, is something apart from space and time, and independent of them; hence nothing that takes place in space or time can affect it, except as being an object of its perception.

"He who knows the self as the slayer, and also he who knows it as the slain, they both know not rightly. It kills not, nor is killed," says the *Bhagavad-Gita.*

In comparison with the realness of the self, time and space are *mayas,* "illusory appearances," as Carlyle says.

And what we call the dimensions of space are only expressions by which the imagination distinguishes and separates various phases of perception.

As the previous advances in development which we have been able to trace, were made by the real self detaching itself entirely from the world it was experiencing, and standing apart as "a disinterested spectator" to view this world, recognising the organ of sensation, and afterwards the personality, as not the self: so, we learn, the next advance in development is made when a man, "by his awakened spiritual will, recognises the individuality as not himself," and detaches himself from his present world, of which the individuality is lord.

The step must be taken by detachment from the things of time, as we know them—by standing apart from these, and, in consequence, by standing apart from that unreal centre of this life, the personality, the abandonment of which leads to a condition we can only describe negatively as selflessness, and by plunging fearlessly into the unknown abyss.

—CHARLES JOHNSTON, F.T.S.

letters • questions • comment

Recent studies in sleep, as reported in Lookout, have shown the importance of deep sleep for physical and psychic well-being. Is there, in addition to this, a possibility of spiritual development during deep sleep, and if so, is there a way of bringing it into waking life?

There is no spiritual "development" in deep sleep, although there is experience of higher planes. In deep sleep we are on the plane of spirit, whereas in waking life we are on the plane of matter. We sometimes fail to recognize that spirit does not mean something mortal, nor does it mean something immortal. It means a mode of life, a plane or condition of the action of consciousness—almost, you might say, the antithesis of the mode of action that we are familiar with. In spirit there is no such thing as particularized or separative knowledge, as we use the term; by this word we usually mean definition of relationships—that is, we know our friends and we know our enemies; we know our weaknesses and our strengths; we know whether the water is hot or cold, etc. Spiritual knowledge is concerned with timeless realities. It is awareness growing out of *rapport*.

For example, suppose we knew such a being as is called an adept, and that it were possible to bring our "self" into union with his self, our consciousness into union with his consciousness. We should, during the time of union, participate in degree in his knowledge, and he in ours. Thus, there is a kind of knowledge or experience which is not gained by contact, but by communion. That is spiritual knowledge.

Consider then that during deep sleep there is a rapport of our consciousness with the consciousness of intelligences on higher planes. This occurs as a sort of fusion, which might be illustrated by the physical plane analogy of hydrogen and oxygen. Each is a gaseous element, a distinct entity, with powers, functions, and characteristics all its own. Yet by combining these elements in a certain relation and proportion, and firing with an electric spark, both hydrogen and oxygen seem to disappear and we have water, which

has characteristics quite different from either. Yet neither gas has been destroyed, for if we disintegrate the water, each again appears.

Yet in the waking man there are various elements, and in sleep a separation of these takes place. Two remain involved in sleep—the molecular, or vital astral body, and the physical body. As the man begins to dream, he enters a field made by his memories, desires, anticipations, hopes and fears, all the many things that have filled his mind during the day. When dreaming is over and the deep sleep state is entered, the region of astral awareness is left behind.

What is the condition of the man now? This can only be spoken of generally, but it is a condition of direct perception, where he is able to enter into the union of consciousness. For just as there can be contact in action, so there can be union of consciousness. We all experience it; we all gain from it. But when we come back to waking life, we have for the most part left behind what we there knew, what we there saw and experienced.

There is a statement in the teachings that will help to clarify this idea. At the time of initiation, which means at the time of union, the highest initiate and the humblest hierophant interpenetrate in awareness, but when cut off from union, the initiate has optimum memory while the disciple remembers only what he can. So, though we are able to enter into union with others, the great problem is to bring that knowledge through into the waking consciousness. Actually, with most of us it is not brought through with any coherence at all. So the great need is to so change the mind and the moral nature that we may learn to act here as we all act spiritually. Then, instead of always explaining ourselves in words and actions, we would simply know, together, as initiates know together. There would be a kind of osmosis of thought that would enable our wills to join and our feelings to unite. Call it a higher clairvoyance, or direct perception.

Now, since the actual nature of all beings is one and we all came from the same Source, we all have fundamentally the same powers. We are all together engaged in the same task. So it follows that on the plane of spirit, seeing this and knowing this, we experience no disharmony. But *here,* we haven't a spiritualized body to work with; we are working with an impure mind and an impure physical body, and we act at cross-purposes with nature, with each other, and with ourselves. We have, therefore, not to attempt to bring the spiritual nature in line with the mental—that is what most reli-

gionists and even some theosophical students try to do. What we need to do is to bring our mental and moral nature in line with the spiritual. To just the extent that this is done, nature becomes an open book to a man, and the harmony of the deep sleep state can be reflected in the waking.

In the following passage, Robert Crosbie shows that polarity of thought determines whether what we gain from egoic communion in deep sleep is lost or becomes a force in waking life:

> Everything that we do in life, every result that we experience, is governed by some attitude of mind which we hold in regard to life. If one is an atheist, let us say, or a materialist, who thinks that life began with this body and will end with it, then all his thoughts and acts will be on that basis. But if he changes that idea, as he may, for the idea that he is immortal in essential nature, then that of itself begins to work a *transformation*.
>
> It is not what we go through that counts; but what we learn from it. Knowledge is what we should desire; not comforts nor station. We desire to know, for in knowing we perceive the right things to do, the right thoughts to hold. As we are thinking all the time, we are thinking either good or evil or indifferent thoughts; our actions are good, evil or indifferent according to our thoughts. If we begin to think aright, we give direction to that Spiritual Force which is the very essence of our nature. Let a man think aright, let him think and act unselfishly, and just so surely as he does that he opens up the channels of his brain to a greater and greater perception and realization of his own nature. When he reaches a certain point he is able to perceive that whether the body is awake or asleep or dreaming, or whether the body has passed through the state called death—*there is no cessation for him.*
>
> Supposing we were able to pass from waking to dreaming, from dreaming to sleeping, from sleeping to death, from death to re-birth in another body—and able to go through all these states and changes without a single break of memory, so that we could not only carry the memory intact from lower to higher states, but bring it through with us from higher to lower states, through every plane, bringing back the knowledge into this or another body—what would we be? Then we would know just what we are. We would know the relation of this plane to every other. We could read the hearts of men. (*The Friendly Philosopher*, pp. 261-62.)

THE WISDOM RELIGION

Gnosticism II

CHRISTOS, as a unity, is but an abstraction: a general idea representing the collective aggregation of the numberless spirit-entities, which are the direct emanations of the infinite, invisible, incomprehensible First Cause—the individual spirits of men, erroneously called the souls. They are the divine sons of God, of which some only overshadow mortal men—but this the majority —some remain forever planetary spirits, and some—the smaller and rare minority—unite themselves during life with some men. Such God-like beings as Gautama-Buddha, Jesus, Tissoo, Christna, and a few others had united themselves with their spirits permanently—hence, they became gods on earth. Others, such as Moses, Pythagoras, Apollonius, Plotinus, Confucius, Plato, Iamblichus, and some Christian saints, having at intervals been so united, have taken rank in history as demi-gods and leaders of mankind. When unburthened of their terrestrial tabernacles, their freed souls, henceforth united forever with their spirits, rejoin the whole shining host, which is bound together in one spiritual solidarity of thought and deed, and called "the anointed." Hence, the meaning of the Gnostics, who, by saying that "Christos" suffered spiritually for humanity, implied that his Divine Spirit suffered mostly.

Such, and far more elevating were the ideas of Marcion, the great "Heresiarch" of the second century, as he is termed by his opponents. He came to Rome toward the latter part of the half-century, from A.D. 139-142, according to Tertullian, Irenæus, Clemens, and most of his modern commentators, such as Bunsen, Tischendorf, Westcott, and many others. Credner and Schleiermacher agree as to his high and irreproachable personal character, his pure religious aspirations and elevated views. His influence must have been powerful, as we find Epiphanius writing more than two centuries later that in his time the followers of Marcion were to be found throughout the whole world.

Note.—This series began in the November, 1966, issue. Sources for this section: *Isis Unveiled* II, 159-66; 168-69.

The danger must have been pressing and great indeed, if we are to judge it to have been proportioned with the opprobrious epithets and vituperation heaped upon Marcion by the "Great African," that Patristic Cerberus, whom we find ever barking at the door of the Irenæan dogmas. We have but to open his celebrated refutation of Marcion's *Antitheses,* to acquaint ourselves with the *fine-fleur* of monkish abuse of the Christian school; an abuse so faithfully carried through the middle ages, to be renewed again in our present day—at the Vatican. "Now, then, ye hounds, yelping at the God of Truth, whom the apostles cast out, to all your questions. These are the bones of contention which ye gnaw." "The poverty of the Great African's arguments keeps pace with his abuse," remarks the author of *Supernatural Religion.* "Their (the Father's) religious controversy bristles with misstatements, and is turbid with pious abuse. Tertullian was a master of his style, and the vehement vituperation with which he opens and often interlards his work against 'the impious and sacrilegious Marcion,' offers anything but a guarantee of fair and legitimate criticism."

How firm these two Fathers—Tertullian and Epiphanius—were on their theological ground, may be inferred from the curious fact that they intemperately both vehemently reproach "the beast" (Marcion) "with erasing passages from the *Gospel of Luke* which never were in *Luke* at all." "The lightness and inaccuracy," adds the critic, "with which Tertullian proceeds, are all the better illustrated by the fact that not only does he accuse Marcion falsely, but *he actually defines the motives* for which he expunged a passage *which never existed;* in the same chapter he also similarly accuses Marcion of erasing (from *Luke*) the saying that Christ had not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them, and he actually repeats the charge on two other occasions. Epiphanius also commits the mistake of reproaching Marcion with omitting from *Luke* what is only found in *Matthew.*"

Having so far shown the amount of reliance to be placed in the Patristic literature, and it being unanimously conceded by the great majority of biblical critics that what the Fathers fought for was not *truth,* but their own interpretations and unwarranted assertions,[1]

[1] This author, Vol. II. p. 103, remarks with great justice of the "Heresiarch" Marcion, "whose high personal character exerted so powerful an influence upon his own time," that "it was the misfortune of Marcion to live in an age when Christianity had passed out of the pure morality of its infancy; when, untroubled by complicated questions of dogma, simple faith and pious enthusiasm had been the one great bond of Christian

we will now proceed to state what were the views of Marcion, whom Tertullian desired to annihilate as the most dangerous *heretic* of his day. If we are to believe Hilgenfeld, one of the greatest German biblical critics, then "From the critical standing-point one must . . . consider the statements of the Fathers of the Church only as expressions of their subjective view, which itself requires proof."

We can do no better nor make a more correct statement of facts concerning Marcion than by quoting what our space permits from *Supernatural Religion,* the author of which bases his assertions on the evidence of the greatest critics, as well as on his own researches. He shows in the days of Marcion "two broad parties in the primitive Church"—one considering Christianity "a mere continuation of the law, and dwarfing it into an Israelitish institution, a narrow sect of Judaism"; the other representing the glad tidings "as the introduction of a new system, applicable to all, and supplanting the Mosaic dispensation of the law by a universal dispensation of grace." These two parties, he adds, "were popularly represented in the early Church, by the two apostles Peter and Paul, and their antagonism is faintly revealed in the *Epistle to the Galatians.*"[2]

---

brotherhood, into a phase of ecclesiastical development in which religion was fast degenerating into theology, and complicated doctrines were rapidly assuming the rampant attitude which led to so much bitterness, persecution, and schism. In later times Marcion might have been honored as a reformer, in his own he was denounced as a heretic. Austere and ascetic in his opinions, he aimed at superhuman purity, and, although his clerical adversaries might scoff at his impracticable doctrines regarding marriage and the subjugation of the flesh, they have had their parallels amongst those whom the Church has since most delighted to honor, and, at least, the whole tendency of his system was markedly towards the side of virtue." These statements are based upon Credner's *Beitrage* I, p. 40.

[2] But on the other hand, this antagonism is very *strongly* marked in the *Clementine Homilies,* in which Peter unequivocally denies that Paul, whom he calls Simon the Magician, has ever had a *vision* of Christ, and calls him "an enemy." Canon Westcott says: "There can be no doubt that St. Paul is referred to as 'the enemy' " ("On the Canon," p. 252, note 2; *Supernatural Religion,* Vol. II, p. 35). But this antagonism, which rages unto the present day, we find even in St. Paul's Epistles. What can be more energetic than such like sentences: "Such are *false* apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. . . . I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostle" (II Cor. 11:13). "Paul, an apostle *not of men,* neither by man, but by Jesus Christ *and* God the Father, who raised him from the dead . . . but there be some that trouble you, and *would pervert* the Gospel of Christ . . . *false brethren.* . . . When Peter came to Antioch I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, *he did eat* with the Gentiles, but when they were come he withdrew, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled . . . insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their *dissimulation,*" etc., etc. (Galat. 1:7; 2: 11, 13). On the other hand, we find Peter in the *Homilies,* indulging in various complaints which, although alleged to be addressed to Simon Magus, are evidently all direct answers to the above-quoted sentences from the Pauline Epistles, and *cannot* have anything to do with Simon. So, for instance, Peter said: "For some among the Gentiles have rejected my lawful preaching, and accepted certain *lawless* and *foolish* teaching of the hostile men (enemy)"—Epist. of Peter to James, § 2. He says further:

Marcion, who recognized no other Gospels than a few Epistles of Paul, who rejected totally the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament, and drew a distinct line of demarcation between the old Judaism and Christianity, viewed Jesus neither as a King, Messiah of the Jews, nor the son of David, who was in any way connected with the law or prophets, "but a divine being sent to reveal to man a spiritual religion, wholly new, and a God of goodness and grace hitherto unknown." The "Lord God" of the Jews in his eyes, the Creator (Demiurgos), was totally different and distinct from the Deity who sent Jesus to reveal the divine truth and preach the glad tidings, to bring reconciliation and salvation to all. The mission of Jesus—according to Marcion—was to abrogate the Jewish "Lord," who "was opposed to the God and Father of Jesus Christ as *matter is to spirit, impurity to purity.*"

Was Marcion so far wrong? Was it blasphemy, or was it intuition, divine inspiration in him to express that which every honest heart yearning for truth, more or less feels and acknowledges? If in his sincere desire to establish a purely spiritual religion, a universal faith based on unadulterated truth, he found it necessary to make of Christianity an entirely new and separate system from that of Juda-

---

"Simon (Paul) . . . who came before me to the Gentiles . . . and I have followed him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance, as health upon disease" *Homil*, ii. 17). Still further, he calls him *Death* and a *deceiver* (*Ibid.*, ii. 18). He warns the Gentiles that "our Lord and *Prophet* (?) (*Jesus*) announced that he would send from among his followers, apostles to *deceive*. "Therefore, above all, remember to avoid every apostle, or teacher, or prophet, who first does not accurately compare his teaching with that of James, called the brother of our Lord" (see the difference between Paul and James on *faith*, Epist. to Hebrews, 11, 12, and Epist. of James, 2). "Lest the Evil One should send a false preacher . . . as he has sent to us Simon (?) preaching a counterfeit of truth in the name of our Lord, and disseminating error" (*Hom.* xi., 35; see above quotation from Gal. 1, 5). He then denies Paul's assertion, in the following words: "If, therefore, our Jesus indeed appeared in a vision to you, it was only as an irritated adversary. . . . But how can any one through visions become wise in teaching? And if you say, 'it is possible,' then I ask, wherefore did the Teacher remain for a whole year and discourse to those who were attentive? And how can *we believe your story that he appeared to you?* And in what manner did he appear to you, when you hold opinions contrary to his teaching? . . . For you now set yourself up against me, who am a *firm rock, the foundation of the Church*. If you were not an opponent, you would not calumniate me, you would not revile my teaching . . . (circumcision?) in order that, in declaring what I have myself heard from the Lord, I may not be believed, as though *I were condemned*. . . . But if you say that I am condemned, you blame God who revealed Christ to me." "This last phrase," observes the author of *Supernatural Religion*, 'if you say that I am condemned,' is an evident allusion to Galat. 2:11, 'I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned' " (*Supernatural Religion*, p. 37). "There cannot be a doubt," adds the just-quoted author, "that the Apostle Paul is attacked in this religious romance as the great enemy of the true faith, under the hated name of Simon the Magician, whom Peter follows everywhere for the purpose of unmasking and confuting him" (p. 34). And if so, then we must believe that it was St. Paul who broke both his legs in Rome when flying in the air.

ism, did not Marcion have the very words of Christ for his authority? "No man putteth a piece of new cloth into an old garment . . . for the rent is made worse. . . . Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but *they put new wine into new bottles,* and both are *preserved.*" In what particular does the jealous, wrathful, revengeful God of Israel resemble the unknown deity, the God of mercy preached by Jesus;—*his* Father who is in Heaven, and the Father of all humanity? This Father alone is the God of spirit and purity, and, to compare Him with the subordinate and capricious Sinaitic Deity is an error. Did Jesus ever pronounce the name of Jehovah? Did he ever place *his* Father in contrast with this severe and cruel Judge; his God of mercy, love, and justice, with the Jewish genius of retaliation? Never! From that memorable day when he preached his Sermon on the Mount, an immeasurable void opened between his God and that other deity who fulminated his commands from that other mount—Sinai. The language of Jesus is unequivocal; it implies not only rebellion but defiance of the Mosaic "Lord God." "Ye have heard," he tells us, "that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but *I say* unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Ye have heard that it hath been said [by the same "Lord God" on Sinai]: Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But *I say* unto you; Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Matt. 5).

And now, open *Manu* and read:

"Resignation, *the action of rendering good for evil,* temperance, probity, purity, repression of the senses, the knowledge of the *Sastras* (the holy books), that of the supreme soul, truthfulness and abstinence from anger, such are the ten virtues in which consists duty. . . . Those who study these ten precepts of duty, and after having studied them conform their lives thereto, will reach to the supreme condition" (*Manu,* book vi., sloka 92).

If *Manu* did not trace these words many thousands of years before the era of Christianity, at least no voice in the whole world will dare deny them a less antiquity than several centuries B.C. The same in the case of the precepts of Buddhism.

If we turn to the *Prâtimoksha Sûtra* and other religious tracts of the Buddhists, we read the ten following commandments:

1. Thou shalt not kill any living creature.
2. Thou shalt not steal.
3. Thou shalt not break thy vow of chastity.
4. Thou shalt not lie.
5. Thou shalt not betray the secrets of others.
6. Thou shalt not wish for the death of thy enemies.
7. Thou shalt not desire the wealth of others.
8. Thou shalt not pronounce injurious and foul words.
9. Thou shalt not indulge in luxury (sleep on soft beds or be lazy).
10. Thou shalt not accept gold or silver.

"Good master, what shall I do that I may have eternal life?" asks a man of Jesus. "Keep the commandments." "Which?" "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness," is the answer.

"What shall I do to obtain possession of Bhodi? (knowledge of eternal truth)," asks a disciple of his Buddhist master. "What way is there to become an Upasaka?" "Keep the commandments." "What are they?" "Thou shalt abstain all thy life from murder, theft, adultery, and lying," answers the master.

Identical injunctions are they not? Divine injunctions, the living up to which would purify and exalt humanity. But are they more divine when uttered through one mouth than another? If it is godlike to return good for evil, does the enunciation of the precept by a Nazarene give it any greater force than its enunciation by an Indian, or Thibetan philosopher? We see that the Golden Rule was not original with Jesus: that its birth-place was India. Do what we may, we cannot deny Sakya-Muni Buddha a less remote antiquity than several centuries before the birth of Jesus. In seeking a model for his system of ethics why should Jesus have gone to the foot of the Himalayas rather than to the foot of Sinai, but that the doctrines of Manu and Gautama harmonized exactly with his own philosophy, while those of Jehovah were to him abhorrent and terrifying? The Hindus taught to return *good for evil*, but the Jehovistic command was: "An eye for an eye" and "a tooth for a tooth."

Would Christians still maintain the identity of the "Father" of Jesus and Jehovah, if evidence sufficiently clear could be adduced that the "Lord God" was no other than the Pagan Bacchus, Dionysos? Well, this identity of the Jehovah at Mount Sinai with the god Bacchus is hardly disputable. The name Yava or Iao, accord-

ing to Theodoret, is the *secret* name of the Phœnician Mystery-god;[3] and it was actually adopted from the Chaldeans with whom it also was the secret name of the creator. Wherever Bacchus was worshipped there was a tradition of Nysa and a cave where he was reared. Beth-San or Scythopolis in Palestine had that designation; so had a spot on Mount Parnassus. But Diodorus declares that Nysa was between Phœnicia and Egypt; Euripides states that Dionysos came to Greece from India; and Diodorus adds his testimony: "Osiris was brought up in Nysa, in Arabia the Happy; he was the son of Zeus, and was named from his father (nominative Zeus, genitive *Dios*) and the place Dio-Nysos"—the Zeus or Jove of Nysa. This identity of name or title is very significant. In Greece Dionysos was second only to Zeus, and Pindar says:

> So Father Zeus governs all things, and Bacchus he governs also.

But outside Greece Bacchus was the all-powerful "Zagreus, the highest of gods." Moses seems to have worshipped him personally and together with the populace at Mount Sinai; unless we admit that he was an *initiated* priest, an adept, who knew how to lift the veil which hangs behind all such exoteric worship, but kept the secret. *"And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-*NISSI!" or *Iao Nisi.* What better evidence is required to show that the Sinaitic god was indifferently Bacchus, Osiris, and Jehovah? Mr. Sharpe appends also his testimony that the place where Osiris was born "was Mount Sinai, called by the Egyptians Mount Nissa." The Brazen Serpent was a *nis,* and the month of the Jewish Passover *nisan.*

If the Mosaic "Lord God" was the only living God, and Jesus His only Son, how account for the rebellious language of the latter? Without hesitation or qualification he sweeps away the Jewish *lex talionis* and substitutes for it the law of charity and self-denial. If the Old Testament is a divine revelation, how can the New Testament be? Are we required to believe and worship a Deity who contradicts himself every few hundred years? Was Moses inspired, or was Jesus *not* the son of God? This is a dilemma from which the theologians are bound to rescue us. It is from this dilemma that the Gnostics endeavored to snatch the budding Christianity.

Justice has been waiting nineteen centuries for intelligent commentators to appreciate this difference between the orthodox Ter-

[3] See Judges 13:18, "And the angel of the Lord said unto him: Why askest thou after my name, seeing it is SECRET?"

tullian and the Gnostic Marcion. The brutal violence, unfairness, and bigotry of the "great African" repulse all who accept his Christianity. "How can a god," inquired Marcion, "break his own commandments? How could he consistently prohibit idolatry and image-worship, and still cause Moses to set up the brazen serpent? How command: Thou shalt not steal, and then order the Israelites to *spoil* the Egyptians of their gold and silver?" Anticipating the results of modern criticism, Marcion denies the applicability to Jesus of the so-called Messianic prophecies. Writes the author of *Supernatural Religion*: "The Emmanuel of Isaiah is not Christ; the 'Virgin,' his mother, is simply a 'young woman,' an alma of the temple; and the sufferings of the servant of God (*Isaiah* lii. 13-liii. 3) are not predictions of the death of Jesus."[4]

Marcion maintained, with the other Gnostics, the fallaciousness of the idea of an incarnate God, and therefore denied the corporeal reality of the living body of Christ. His entity was a mere illusion; it was not made of human flesh and blood, neither was it born of a human mother, for his divine nature could not be polluted with any contact with sinful flesh. He accepted Paul as the only apostle preaching the pure gospel of truth, and accused the other disciples of "depraving the pure form of the gospel doctrines delivered to them by Jesus, mixing up matters of the Law with the words of the Saviour."

Many of our eminent antiquarians trace the Gnostic philosophies right back to Buddhism, which does not impair in the least either their or our arguments. We repeat again, *Buddhism is but the primitive source of Brahmanism.* It is not against the primitive *Vedas* that Gautama protests. It is against the sacerdotal and official state religion of his country; and the Brahmans, who in order to make

---

[4] Emmanuel was doubtless the son of the prophet himself, as described in the sixth chapter: what was predicted, can only be interpreted on that hypothesis. The prophet had also announced to Ahaz the extinction of his line. "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established." Next comes the prediction of the placing of a new prince on the throne—Hezekiah of Bethlehem, said to have been Isaiah's son-in-law, under whom the captives should return from the uttermost parts of the earth. Assyria should be humbled, and peace overspread the Israelitish country, compare Isaiah 7:14-16; 8:3, 4; 9:6, 7; 10:12, 20, 21; 11; Micah 5:2-7. The popular party, the party of the prophets, always opposed to the Zadokite priesthood, had resolved to set aside Ahaz and his time-serving policy, which had let in Assyria upon Palestine, and to set up Hezekiah, a man of their own, who should rebel against Assyria and overthrow the Assur-worship and Baalim (II Kings 15:11). Though only the prophets hint this, it being cut out from the historical books, it is noticeable that Ahaz offered his own child to Moloch, also that he died at the age of thirty-six, and Hezekiah took the throne at twenty-five, in full adult age.

room for and give authority to the castes, at a later period crammed the ancient manuscripts with interpolated slokas, intended to prove that the castes were predetermined by the Creator by the very fact that each class of men was issued from a more or less noble limb of Brahma. Gautama-Buddha's philosophy was that taught from the beginning of time in the impenetrable secrecy of the inner sanctuaries of the pagodas. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find again, in all the fundamental dogmas of the Gnostics, the metaphysical tenets of both Brahmanism and Buddhism. They held that the Old Testament was the revelation of an inferior being, a subordinate divinity, and did not contain a single sentence of their *Sophia,* the Divine Wisdom. As to the New Testament, it had lost its purity when the compilers became guilty of interpolations. The revelation of divine truth was sacrificed by them to promote selfish ends and maintain quarrels.

Reflections of Undying Truth

We know something of Celtic doctrine from early Welsh poetry and Breton folklore. It seems to have had much in common with some forms of Eastern thought. Life was considered as a time of trial: if its initiation was successfully passed, the spirit rested after death until the moment came for another return to earth. This continued until, after many lives, some attained the state of spiritual perfection that admitted them to Gwenved, the "white" heaven where they became fully conscious of God. They chose, however, to return as teachers to mankind from time to time until that ultimate and future moment should come when all humanity would attain their state.

It need not surprise us to find these similarities with some forms of Buddhism. England seems to have been in contact with the East from very early times. Egyptian faïence beads have been found in Wessex graves and a probably Mycenaean dagger was discovered at Stonehenge. Irish Christianity was influenced by the austere practices of the hermits in the Egyptian deserts and rebirth itself seems to have been accepted for a time by some of the early Christian Fathers.

—Bryher: Foreword to *Ruan*

on the lookout

Reincarnated Romans?

Something over thirty-five years ago, an English historian and archaeologist, Arthur Weigall, contributed to *Colliers* an article titled "Ancient Romans of the U.S.A." in which he drew parallels between the ways of the Romans and the civilization of the United States. Much of this article was quoted in THEOSOPHY (April, 1932), it seeming clear that this thoughtful antiquarian, who had the habit of spending several months of each year in America, had in reality compiled evidence to support a statement made in *The Ocean of Theosophy*: "For as the masses of persons return from *devachan,* it must follow that the Roman, the Greek, the old Aryan, and other Ages will be seen again and can to a very great extent be plainly traced."

The analogies between the two cultures cover very nearly every aspect of private and public life. The Romans, Mr. Weigall pointed out, "were the richest people in the world." He quoted Juvenal: "With us, it is wealth that is worshipped." And in 33 A.D. a great financial crash closed banks and ruined many Roman businesses; yet there was a speedy recovery from the resulting depression. Of the prevailing attitudes, Weigall wrote:

> Nobody in politics thought himself rich unless he could finance his party out of his own pocket and pay for the votes which supported his cause. . . .
>
> American millionaires have the habit of erecting public buildings at their own expense, which is a characteristic not shared to any great extent with the millionaires of Europe, but is curiously like that of the Romans. The Pantheon, for instance, was built at the private expense of a gentleman named Agrippa: and the church built by a gentleman named Rockefeller on Riverside Drive, New York, affords a close parallel to it. Pompey the Great built a huge theatre for the Roman people with his own money; and in this connection one thinks at once of Mr. Carnegie, as also one does on reading that Julius Caesar had quite a mania for providing the populace with free libraries.

> And how those Roman millionaires collected paintings, statues and antiques! They were not often very cultured men, but they were most anxious to be thought so; and it was considered extremely smart to possess ancient Greek works of art, old books and manuscripts, old tapestries and that sort of thing. They said their wives liked to have them. . . .

The parallels go on and on, including the excellent plumbing of both civilizations, other common features being the love of pleasure, the plan of their cities, the relations of respectable businessmen and politicians with gangsters, and their nightclubs, scandals, and corruption. Finally, Mr. Weigall says:

> I might instance a hundred other points of resemblance, but it is not in the details so much, perhaps, as in the general spirit of the nation that ancient Rome lives again in modern America. The hustle, the getting rich quick, the love of money and its power, the desire to live in magnificence and comfort, the odd mixture of warm sentiment and callous disregard of human life —all these things which are considered to be the characteristics of the American people in the mass were features also of life in ancient Rome.

Further Analogy

Writing back in the thirties, Mr. Weigall's intent was to explain his fondness for the United States, where his familiarity with ancient Roman civilization made him feel at home. But since the parallels exist, becoming plain to anyone who studies history, it is not remarkable that a present-day scholar, Stringfellow Barr, finds more melancholy reasons for drawing a comparison. Mr. Barr's recent study, *Consulting the Romans,* published as an occasional paper by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, is concerned specifically with the Roman and the American propensity to solve problems by making war. His paper is sub-titled, "An Analogy Between Ancient Rome and Present-Day America." In one place Mr. Barr summarizes Roman history:

> During its seven and a quarter centuries of existence, Rome had learned many important lessons, but she believed she had learned one lesson above all others: that the only foundation for law and order in the human community is the over-powering force of government; for force moves matter, including both the bodies and the minds of men. . . . In order to rule, the Romans sought, not to move men's minds so much as men's wills. This was done with rewards and punishments, though the order in which these forces were used in foreign affairs was more often punishment first; the reward of moderate treatment followed

> when there was unconditional surrender. Over and over again in her history, Rome refused to negotiate until her enemy had disarmed himself and sued for mercy. She made herself the policeman of the whole civilized world, or the only one with which the Republic had any contact, until she collided with another policeman, Parthia, whom she lacked the force to conquer.
>
> True, the Roman used not only the sword but the word. But he commonly used it for the same purpose, not to enlighten the mind but to move the will.

The Power of Self-Righteousness

The point of Mr. Barr's final comment, here, is that the Romans studied Greek rhetoric, not to find the truth, but to acquire the techniques of persuasion. Mr. Barr adds: "But perhaps the Romans' most powerful weapon was the one Dido hated in Aeneas, the one which perhaps kept his goddess mother from risking a conversation with him: self-righteousness." The power in this weapon lay in the inability of the Romans to consider that they might be *wrong*. They were guided by Jove, and how could a piety attended by so much practical success ever be questioned? So the Romans applied their forceful persuasion with single-minded conviction. At the end of the discussion of his paper, Mr. Barr makes this concluding remark:

> Rome was not bloodthirsty; she merely relied on force in such a way as to paralyze her imagination and make her inattentive to her neighbors. And I believe there is an analogy here with the United States.

Voices of Dissent

But while there are analogies between Rome and the United States, there are also differences. Other currents are flowing in the American life of today, and if some of them are bewildering and frightening, there are signs of awakening to another kind of "righteousness" beneath the unrest and confusions of the present. Something of this awakening is described by a grandmother who addressed a letter to the Los Angeles *Times* of Feb. 25, to protest an article, "The Cult of the Alienated Youth." "I believe," she wrote, "that we, the adult community, are alienating our youth through fear."

This letter continues:

> We fear the natural revolution of youth and its aim to replace us. We fear exposure, by comparison, of our physical limitations, our mental rigidities, our corrupt adherence to ancient

> and ineffective processes. We fear the possibility that, as leaders of tomorrow, this generation will expose our failures by rebelling against and finding cures for war, international bickering, racial indignities by sheet-hooded hoodlums (KKK), Presidential assassinations, poverty, ignorance and moral hypocrisies. . . .
>
> I do not contend that all rebellion is productive. Wrongfully directed it distorts and discredits righteous and necessary rebellion. However, I believe youth is proving its moral integrity by rebelling against a system that forces youth to fight in a war it is too young to vote against. I believe youth is exemplifying its social conscience by rebelling against a system that doles out its civil rights according to a man's color. I believe that our youth is practicing honest patriotism when it rebels against a system that calls peace un-American.

The Romans heard no such dissident voices as these, and while they had critics who mourned the loss of Republican virtue and Patrician dignity in Rome, the birth of another vision of social life was left to another time and era. So there is at least an opportunity, now, to avoid the vast "decline" into which Roman civilization fell, through recognition of the power of moral causation. In a great cycle of decision such as the present, the streams of karmic influence from the past are never simple and single, and the perspective of cyclic law and the promise of Manasic awakening give ground for hope, even if we cannot have, as yet, a clear sight of how far-reaching changes for the better may take place.

Secular Study of Religion—a Challenge

From time to time, Lookout has cited the stand of the *Christian Century* favoring separation of church and state, keeping prayer out of the public schools, etc., but it should be noted that this position is also taken by the *Register-Leader* (Unitarian-Universalist organ). An article in the February *R-L,* "Separation is not Enough," by John A. Taylor, director of the Channing-Murray Foundation at the University of Illinois, reviews the efforts these denominations have made throughout the years in pursuit of this ideal. But, he says,

> It is important to understand that separation is only part of the quest for religious freedom and religious maturity. We also need appreciation, knowledge, and insight. Separation alone will lead to historical shallowness, religious retardation, and theological idiocy. . . . The attitude which must prevail within the classroom concerned with religion is one of objective scholarship—exactly that kind of attitude which should prevail in

the classroom concerned with mathematics or in the laboratory concerned with chemistry.

Toward Intelligent Understanding

Mr. Taylor admits that the efforts expended have met with few successes, many failures. "There can," he says, "be no success so long as the religion which is practiced in the majority of orthodox and liberal churches continues to be appalling in its ignorance." To offset the mental inertia of congregations and the obsession of ministers in maintaining the traditional status quo, religious instruction on state campuses, he warns, must be aimed at insisting on a scholarly approach to religion and in improving its intellectual content. This offers a challenge, as Mr. Taylor shows in his concluding paragraphs:

> Can a state-college community be constructed in which the religious phenomenon can be understood as an aspect of the intellectual life, as an aspect of the scholar's search? There are dangers. Some will seek to take advantage of the situation and proclaim an "only gospel." Some will endeavor to claim quality where there is only inferiority, objectivity where there is only subjectivity. Some will attempt to persuade rather than inform; control rather than teach.
>
> But others will see the new era as an opportunity to bring religion before the strong light of secular scholarship, an opportunity to provide a confrontation of ideas with ideals, and an opportunity in which religion can free itself of the bonds of sacredness and enjoy the freedom of the secular scholarly community. But most of all it is an opportunity to build new and intelligent understanding in an environment where confusion and suspicion too often have been dominant. . . . It is a challenge to affirm the American theory of church-state separation while realizing that separation is not enough.

WHO Rules on Vaccination

A correspondent who recently returned from a trip to Europe has supplied "On the Lookout" with the following information:

> Under Article 83 of the World Health Organization International Sanitary Regulations, one can refuse to be vaccinated upon leaving the country, and may only be required to report at certain times for fourteen days after return to the United States. A copy of Article 83 may be obtained by writing to the World Health Organization, 525 Twenty-third Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. Following is the relevant portion of the text of Article 83:

"A health administration may require any person on an international voyage who does not show sufficient evidence of protection by a previous attack of smallpox to possess, on arrival, a certificate of vaccination against smallpox. Any such person who cannot produce such a certificate may be vaccinated; if he refuses to be vaccinated, he may be placed under surveillance for not more than fourteen days, reckoned from the date of his departure from the last territory visited before arrival."

Further counsel may be obtained from the Citizens Medical Reference Bureau, Inc., P.O. Box 68, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, which concerns itself with medical freedom and the rights of persons opposed to vaccination. The Bureau, for example, points out that if a traveler encounters resistance to his views on vaccination, he is at liberty to report illegal pressure or coercion to his Senator or Congressman.

The point of this last suggestion is that travelers unwilling to be vaccinated may find it necessary to insist upon their rights as defined by the WHO regulations. Pressure to conform to conventional medical opinion still exists despite the fact that, as a Colorado University professor of medicine recently disclosed, "the United States has not had a single death from smallpox since 1948, although it has had nearly 300 deaths resulting from smallpox vaccination."

Famine—A World-wide Problem

Prediction of widespread famine for a high percentage of the world's populations, beginning in the 1970's has stimulated an accelerated program of research and experiment to find new sources of food. An article by George B. Sumyk in the Summer, 1966, issue of *Frontier* (published quarterly by IIT Research Institute) says: ". . . the advance of Famine has been gaining momentum and now threatens to become an unchecked rampage. Famine has indeed been an unwelcome companion of mankind throughout history, but never before have future prospects about food supplies been so grim."

Protein—The Element of Nourishment

The most critical aspect of food shortage is the scarcity of protein in much of the world's diet. Central Africa provides an example:

About fifty per cent of the children from weaning age to school age die. One-third of these deaths is attributable to protein deficiency, although hunger is satisfied because of an ample bulk of starchy foods. The protein-poor diet denies them amino acids essential for normal growth and development. Results are

> either death from kwashiorkor or marasmus, or stunted growth, mental retardation, and susceptibility to infectious diseases.

And a U.N. report (*New York Times,* Nov. 6, 1966) offers a wider view: "Today half the people in the world are ill-fed. Half the world's children of pre-school age are so undernourished that their physical and mental growth is retarded and mortality among these children in the underdeveloped countries is sixty times as great as in more advanced societies."

Inertia—Product of Malnutrition

Increasing the world's food supplies through investment of capital and accelerated application of modern farming techniques is only a partial answer, in Mr. Sumyk's opinion. The inertia of tradition, coupled with lethargy caused by malnutrition, presents formidable obstacles to acceptance of unfamiliar technologies. Further, the introduction of new crops has been known to result in serious biological imbalances. "After guava was introduced into East Africa, for example, it was quickly spread by seed-carrying birds, providing an ideal breeding ground for the tsetse fly and making large areas of useful land uninhabitable."

What seems apparent, in unexpected defeats of this sort, is the play of ancient karmic forces. Application of technology along with modern sanitation and the control of the agents of disease are of course desirable and necessary, but the root causes of misery lie in human attitudes, in the relationships of man with man and in attitudes toward nature, and the elimination of these causes will come, finally, only through philosophical changes of the sort Theosophy endeavors to introduce. There is no malevolence in nature, although it sometimes may seem so, and knowledge of the doctrines of hope and responsibility would go far to contribute the courage and persistence that will be needed to accomplish reforms which are overdue, not only in Africa, but in all parts of the world.

A Modern Magician

Meanwhile, chemistry, called by H.P.B. one of the "magicians of the future," is making strange contributions to theory concerning the resources of world food supply. Experiments with methane gas at the Institute of Gas Technology, Chicago, have led to the belief that the micro-organisms which may prove most valuable as food are bacteria! An advantage of methane bacteria over the

petroleum yeast process is the elimination of difficult purification steps. Another promising source of protein are the hydrogen bacteria. . . . preliminary calculations are that bacterial protein could be produced for less than ten cents per pound, a favorable comparison with the cost of plant and animal protein. Nothing, however, is said of taste and flavors!

Need for Reciprocity

Scientific experiments may extract some of Nature's secrets, but if man "takes" without "giving," his harvest will be bare subsistence —the reluctant compliance of the robbed. This concept of the "wheel" of karma is graphically illustrated by views attributed to Dr. Lynn White, Jr., of UCLA, as summarized in the Los Angeles *Times* (March 15):

> A basic tradition of Christianity may be leading man to his destruction. . . . it is the axiom that nature has no reason to exist save to serve man. This belief has caused an ecologic crisis—a disruption of the balance of nature—that is so serious it "may annihilate us unless we find a new religion or rethink our old one." An answer might be found, says Dr. White, in adopting the attitude of St. Francis of Assisi who believed that animals and birds were just as important as man.
>
> Calling the situation "extremely serious," and noting that some scientists predict man could be wiped out in as little as 100 years, Dr. White says humanity must alter its basic thinking on the man-nature relationship. Abuses of nature ranging from overworked land, attempts to control the rabbit population, to the smog menace from burning fossil fuels are some of the results of this "Christian arrogance," the UCLA professor said in an interview. He stressed that some of these "profound disruptions" of the ecologic balance have been documented and forecast by scientists "who are not crackpots."

A Democracy of Nature

While Dr. White realizes these views may prove unpalatable to many Christians, he points out that "the roots of the increasing imbalance in nature are Western in origin. . . . deeply rooted in Christian theology." The *Times* article continues:

> Dr. White said his study of history shows that Christianity told people that God created plants, animals, birds and fish "explicitly for man's benefit and rule: no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve man's purposes. . . ." "Despite Darwin, he declared, "we are not, in our hearts, part of the natural process. We are superior to nature, contemptuous

of it, willing to use it for our slightest whim." He noted that from the fifth century to the time of Newton every major scientist explained his motivations in religious terms.

The professor said he does not have a blueprint on how we are to save ourselves from the backlash of our own ill-considered actions—but we must rethink our relationship to nature.

The professor said he does not advocate a return to the complete ideas of St. Francis of Assisi. "We can't return. But St. Francis did try to teach us to respect the autonomy of other parts of nature. . . . a democracy of nature, so to speak."

The Roots of Alienation

This view is also implicit in Charton Ogburn, Jr.'s *The Winter Beach* (William Morrow), reviewed by Mrs. Katharine Rosin in *Life* (Nov. 18, 1966). Mr. Ogburn apparently feels that man's alienation from nature began with monotheism:

> Christianity, Judiasm, Islam alienated their converts from their earth, partly in fear of paganism, partly from an obsession with the next world, partly because man found it useful to have a belief behind which he could diminish and alter the natural world for his temporary comfort.

Mrs. Rosin comments: "To one who considers that a small bright orchid in a cold bog or a hummingbird's nest on a twig has, like man, a right to free existence, the author's argument holds some truth. . . . If I read *The Winter Beach* aright, what Mr. Ogburn is telling us is that the flower and the bird are as important as human life: their pointless destruction might be considered sacreligious."

Antivivisection—Positive Approach

An article in the November, 1966, issue of *Alba Spirituale* (organ of the T.S. in Italy) contained information which will doubtless be welcomed by all antivivisectionists. The writer, Gianni La Piana, first notes that an association, "Beauty Without Cruelty," which was formed in England in 1959, now has branches in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. The association "aims at making known every product that has not caused torture or death to animals." One of its pamphlets states that "a growing number of people understand how it is not possible to create a 'new world' for human beings without doing also the same thing for these poor creatures. They believe man has a responsibility towards the animals which he needs to attend to, and that there can be no true, real progress for the world until animals are treated with compassion."

This work is apparently inspired by plans made years ago by the World Coalition Against Vivisection, which spoke of meeting commercial organizations for the manufacture of medicines on their own territory, "by establishing chairs of antivivisectionist medicine, research laboratories without animal experimentation, and above all manufacture of medicines for which no vivisection has been used."

Loyalty Laws and the Supreme Court

"The U.S. Supreme Court in recent years has been gradually extending its doctrine of constitutionally protected freedoms to embrace academic freedom," says Luther J. Carter (*Science,* Feb. 24). In a ruling handed down on Jan. 23, the Court reversed its position on New York statutes that it had upheld in 1952, observing that "our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned." The Court used as precedent for its decision an earlier case in which it had said:

> To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true of the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding, otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.

Unorthodox Therapies in Britain

The interesting thing about unorthodox methods of healing, says the Manchester *Guardian* (Feb. 23), is that they often "work." One of the most recent methods to achieve popularity in England is the ancient Chinese art of acupuncture, based on the theory that the flow of the life force can be stimulated and regulated by puncturing the skin in certain sensitive areas by needles made of different metals. Two Englishmen have just returned from China with "genuine doctorates," and the British Acupuncture Association, which now has one hundred and fifty trained practitioners, expects to have many more trainees for the nine-year course as time goes on. So far—

> The association has a handful of the orthodox converted, but

> doesn't hope for or seek mass adoption of the faith. At the same time it accepts that not everything can be done with needles. You don't, it says—though the Chinese would disagree—stimulate the life force and expect an angry appendix to apologise. There is, the association thinks, room for both the orthodoxy and for them.

Prevailing Attitudes

The only system untaught in medical schools that has found its way into the National Health Service is Homeopathy—and homeopaths have to be allopaths first. Since the 1950's, hypnotism by certified doctors has been sanctioned, and even spiritual healers have been allowed in hospitals! But because osteopaths, chiropractors, naturopaths, and herbalists are at odds among themselves, there is no group strong enough to put adequate pressure on the NHS for admission. British osteopaths, unlike their American counterparts, "wouldn't come in [to the BMA] if they were begged," says the *Guardian,* but about two hundred doctors belong to the Association for Manipulative Medicine, "formed by doctors for doctors to teach them the rudiments of osteopathy and chiropractic." The general situation, then, leads the *Guardian* writer to conclude that while "the edges may be going there's still a lot of prejudice to be melted and organisation to be done."

Today, physicians of every persuasion are well aware of the fact that the mental attitude of the patient is of primary importance in the healing process. As H.P.B. put it:

> Imagination is a potent help in every event of our lives. Imagination acts on Faith, and both are the draughtsmen who prepare the sketches for Will to engrave. This is all the secret. Half, if not two-thirds of our ailings and diseases are the fruit of our imagination and fears. Destroy the latter and give another bent to the former, and nature will do the rest.